

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Without acquiescing or waiving any argument concerning any other rejection of the claims, applicants request reconsideration of only the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11, and 12 by the Final Action.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luce (U.S. Patent No. 1,201,748) in view of Belcher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 1,956,942). Neither Luce nor Belcher disclose a chain having interleaved series of links including links forming two teeth at a front side of the link. As acknowledged by the Final Action, Luce doesn't disclose links forming teeth. Belcher et al. discloses a chain having interleaved rows of links and that drive links of that chain form two teeth. However, the drive links of adjacent rows of links of the chain disclosed by Belcher et al. face in opposite directions, not in the same front direction as now required by claims 1 and 6. Further, as shown by Fig 2 of Belcher et al., the back side of links do not all engage the same sprocket.

Paragraph 4 of the Final Action asserts that claim 1 encompasses chains having links that form teeth that face in opposite directions as do the links of Belcher. Claim 1 requires that "**the drive links of the first and second series** each form two teeth that **extend from the link in a front direction** that is perpendicular to the chain direction and to the first and second lateral directions." Claim one does not state that each link of the first and second series forms teeth that extend in a front direction, but rather that all links of the first and second series form teeth that extend in **a** direction. That statement is consistent with every specification description of the teeth of links of a chain extending in a "front direction". See eg. page 4 lines 21 – 24, page 15, lines 18 - 20. As the Final Action acknowledges, that requirement clearly distinguishes Belcher.

Claim 6 requires that "the power transmission chain engag[es] the back drive sprocket positioning the first series of drive links between and engaging teeth of the first series of sprocket teeth and the second series of drive links between and engaging the second series of sprocket teeth." Belcher et al. does not position the back side of two series of links against the same sprocket. Therefore, the combination of Luce and Belcher et al. does not teach all elements of any pending claim.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luce (U.S. Patent No. 1,201,748) in view of Kozakura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,967,926). Kozakura et al. discloses a chain having conventional teeth on the front side of the chain and that form a flat back surface between to sub-teeth t', surface f of links 2 and 3 as shown by Fig. 3. The chain disclosed by Kozakura et al. does not have guide links on alternating sides of adjacent rows of links, but rather has conventionally positioned opposed guide links on alternating rows. Figs. 3, 6. The guide links of Kozakura et al. provide surfaces that space sub teeth of links adjacent to the guide plates from a shoe face. Col. 4 lines 7 – 17, Fig. 4. The guide links space the sub teeth "slightly" from the shoe face. Id. Kozakura does not suggest that this function could be accomplished if guide links were not at each side of a row of links having sub teeth. Kozakura et al. also discloses a sprocket 6 having teeth that have tops 6A that are arcuate and concentric with the rotational center of the sprocket 6. Kozakura et al. col. 4 lines 1 – 6. The arcuate tops 6A support the flat surfaces f between sub teeth t' of a link. Id. The sub-teeth t' of a link contact a tooth of the sprocket that is between the sub-teeth. Id. That is, the drive surfaces of the sub-teeth contact one sprocket tooth, not adjacent sprocket teeth. Kozakura et al. does not teach that either side of a chain link is accepted between adjacent sprocket teeth. See Kozakura et al. at Fig. 1, col. 3 line 65 – col. 4 line 6.

Claim 6 requires that "the power transmission chain engag[es] the back drive sprocket positioning the first series of drive links between and engaging teeth of the first series of sprocket teeth and the second series of drive links between and engaging the second series of sprocket teeth." Kozakura et al. does not teach that a chain link is positioned between adjacent sprocket teeth. Therefore, the teachings of Kozakura et al. do not meet the requirements of for a link as claimed by claim 6. Therefore, the combination of Luce with the links of Kozakura et al. does not meet the requirements of claim 6, or claims 8 and 12 which depend from it.

Neither Luce, Belcher et al. nor Kozakura et al. nor any other art of record anticipate or render obvious applicants' invention as now claimed. The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly requested.

Appl. No. 09/907,021  
Amendment dated May 25, 2004

Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the deposit account of  
McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 25, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven J. Hampton", is written over a horizontal line.

Steven J. Hampton  
Reg. No. 33,707  
Attorney for Applicants

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile (312) 775-8100